

Remarks

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims set forth in the Official Action of September 22, 2005 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-37 are currently pending.

Claims 1-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-32 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,668 to Doi ("Doi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,397 to Kupiec ("Kupiec"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for generating a summary of an input document. Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, an extraction module receiving an input document and extracting at least one sentence related to a focus of the document. No such arrangement is disclosed in or suggested by Doi, either alone or in combination with Kupiec. While Doi is generally directed to a technique for generating an abstract of a larger document, it does not disclose or suggest extracting at least one sentence related to a focus of the document, as claimed in claim 1.

Instead, Doi uses "hint words" that have been registered, or preselected, in a hint word dictionary. (Doi, col. 2, lines 50-55). Doi further discloses extracting all sentences in the document that contain the hint words. (Doi, col. 3, lines 37-38). The sentences are then combined to produce an abstract. (Doi, col. 3, lines 39-40). In a further embodiment, an

operator selects the hint words that may reflect the content of the document, and which can be subjective and produce different results for different operators depending on the designated hint words. (Doi, col. 3, line 65 - col. 2, line 7). Thus, the hint words used may prove not be the focus of the document. Nothing in Doi discloses or suggests extracting at least one sentence related to a focus of the document as disclosed in claim 1. To the contrary, Doi instead relies on “hint words” that can be indicative of a collection of significant phrases within the document. But, as disclosed by Doi, a collection of phrases containing the preselected hint words may prove not to be the focus of the document and thus require the registration of new hint words. (Doi, col. 4, lines 1-5).

Kupiec does not cure the deficiencies of Doi since Kupiec uses “cue words” in much the same manner as Doi uses hint words. (Kupiec, col. 4, lines 48-55). Accordingly, the combination of Doi and Kupiec fails to disclose or suggest the extraction of at least one sentence related to a focus of a document, as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 2-21 depend from claim 1 and should be patentable for at least those reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of rejections to claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 22-31 are method claims substantially corresponding to system claims 1-21. Therefore, the remarks relating to claims 1-21, set forth above, are equally applicable to claims 22-31. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of rejections to claims 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, a method for identifying correspondence between phrases in a summary and phrases in the original document. Doi and Kupiec are generally

directed to generating a summary, but neither Doi nor Kupiec disclose or suggest mapping a correspondence between the summary phrases and the original phrases as disclosed in claim 32.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 32 and should be patentable for at least those reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 35 recites a system comprising, *inter alia*, a sentence combination subcorpus and a sentence reduction subcorpus that can be used to link original sentence to a human reduced sentence. Neither Doi nor Kupiec discloses or suggests a sentence combination subcorpus or a sentence reduction subcorpus, but instead merely juxtapose extracted sentences, or used to generate future probabilities. (Doi, col. 3, lines 40-41; Kupiec, col. 2, lines 62-65; col. 18, lines 48-55).

Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 35 and should be patentable for at least those reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: 

Paul A. Ragusa
Patent Office Reg. No. 38,587

30 Rockefeller Plaza
44th Floor
New York, NY 10012-4498

Attorney for Applicants

212-408-2500